

TARIFF TALK BEGINS

CHAIRMAN DINGLEY OPENS FOR THE NEW MEASURE.

BILL IS READ ENTIRE

OPPOSITION LEFT WITHOUT A KICK ON THAT SCORE.

GROVER'S FAMOUS WORDS APPLY

BUT IT TOOK FOUR YEARS MORE OF GROVER TO MAKE THEM.

General Wheeler Bourbonizes Against the Bill—Bell of Colorado Speaks for the Pops—The Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—The first day of the tariff debate in the house was rather tame, from both a spectacular and an oratorical standpoint. The galleries were well filled all day and the members on the floor listened conscientiously, but there was an absence both of sharp cross-firing which keeps the nerves on edge and that brilliant eloquence which inspires and holds the imagination. The opening of the debate was delayed over two hours by the full reading of the bill of 182 pages, and this, to begin with, had a somewhat depressing influence. The Republican leaders insisted on this to avoid the possible re-appearance in the future, should the consideration of the bill not be completed under the five-minute rule, of a claim that the bill had not been read in full in the house, a thing which happened in the case of both the McKinley and Wilson bills. Only speeches were made at the day session. Mr. Dingley, the chairman of the ways and means committee, opened in an hour's speech for the majority and Mr. Wheeler of Alabama fired the broadside for the opposition. The plans of the Democrats had miscarried. Mr. Bailey, leader of the opposition, had decided to close the debate and Mr. McMillin of Tennessee had been selected to reply to Mr. Dingley, but at the last moment it was learned that Mr. McMillin had been unable to prepare himself, owing to the illness of his wife. The task, therefore, devolved on Mr. Wheeler. The latter was unprepared, but, nevertheless, took the floor for an hour. Mr. Bell of Colorado blazed the path for the Populists. The only other speaker at the day session was Mr. Hopkins of Illinois, a member of the ways and means committee. Tomorrow it is probable that some of the house followers will be heard.

TARIFF DEBATE OPENED.

Washington, March 22.—What will go down to history as the tariff debate of 1897 began in the house at 10 o'clock this morning. Despite the early hour of assembling there was a large attendance on the floor and the galleries showed evidence of the great interest. The proceedings, Mr. Dingley and Mr. Bailey, the opposing leaders, were early in their places. By the terms of the rule under which the house was to operate during the consideration of the bill, the house immediately resolved itself into committee of the whole and the speaker conferred upon Mr. Sherman (Rep., N. Y.) the distinguished honor of presiding over the committee. Those who expected the debate to begin immediately were disappointed. The leaders decided not to dispense with the reading of the bill but to have it read in full at the outset in order to disarm the criticism passed on previous bills that they were put through without even having been read in the house. The spectators in the galleries and the members on the floor waited while the clerk drove through the 182 pages of the bill. The reading of the bill consumed a little over two hours so it was 12:30 before the leader of the majority, Mr. Dingley, was recognized to open the debate. Mr. Dingley's voice is not very strong and he usually has some difficulty in making himself heard but today he spoke with great deliberation and his tones were clear and ringing.

DINGLEY'S SPEECH.

Mr. Dingley began by saying that Congress having been convened in extra session, the facts that had led to the issuance of the president's message were: That the government revenues during the past four years had been insufficient to meet expenditures to the extent of more than \$200,000,000, or an average of \$50,000,000 per annum; that this deficiency will continue to grow under existing conditions; that the deficiency has not been met by borrowing, that is, by bond sales, and that this has promoted distrust, intensified and prolonged the run on the treasury and weakened business confidence.

"This deficiency of revenue," said Mr. Dingley, "has nearly all arisen from a falling off of revenue from duties on imports and not from a decline of revenue from internal taxes on revenue."

"Revising the tariff," he said, "the committee have endeavored to discard more theories and have addressed themselves to the framing of a practical remedy, at least, in part, for the ills which have for so many months overshadowed the country."

GROVER'S WORDS APPLY NOW.

"It is a condition and not a theory which confronts us. Our problem is to provide adequate revenue for the purpose of enabling the government to carry on its imposing duties to secure this result so adjust them as to secure to our own people the production and manufacture of such articles as we can produce or make for ourselves without natural disadvantage, and thus provide more abundant opportunities for our labor. No economic policy will prove a success unless it shall in some manner contribute to opening up employment to the masses of our people at good wages. When this is accomplished and thus the purchasing power of the masses restored, then and not until then—will peace come to feel the depressing effect of under-consumption and the prosperity of our people rise to the standard of 1892."

ENLIGHTENING YEARS.

"The past four years have been enlightening especially to candid investigators of economic problems. We have

ARE TRUE BOURBONS

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS WILL NEVER, NEVER LEARN.

Grover's World-Famed Object Lesson Counts no More as Showing What a Single Dose of Tariff Reform Will Do to American Industries and Labor.

Then the Many Object Lessons of Republican Protection in Showing What That Policy Will Do for Them—Bailey and His Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—Mr. Bailey of Texas presented to the house tonight the minority report on the tariff bill.

The report was signed by all the Democratic members of the ways and means committee and gives the grounds for the opposition to the bill. It says: "This bill was framed with the avowed purpose of protecting the manufacturers of the United States against foreign competition, and it is perfectly obvious that if it accomplishes that purpose it must result in compelling the consumers of this country to pay more for their manufactured goods, and for this reason we think it should not pass. We rest our opposition upon the broad principle that congress was invested with the power of taxation as a means of collecting from each citizen his fair proportion toward the support of the government, and that it is a gross perversion of that power to employ it as a means of enabling favored classes to levy unjust charges upon the great body of the people. We believe that after contributing his proper share toward the maintenance of the government, every citizen of this republic is entitled to the full possession and enjoyment of all he can honestly earn; and we deny the right of congress to make or enforce any regulation which deprives any man of any part of his honest earnings towards encouraging the enterprise or increasing the fortune of another."

PATERNALISM.

"No man, however blind he may be, would defend a system of taxation under which the government first collected the money and afterwards distributed it among its favorites. It is true that the tariff act of 1890 ventured to this extent in dealing with the sugar growers, but the disapproval of that policy was so overwhelming and so bitter that the advocates of protection have been forced to abandon it, and they have not dared to incorporate any provision for a direct bounty in the present bill. We are unable, however, to perceive any difference in principle between a law which requires the government to collect the money and distribute it among the protected industries and a law which enables these industries to collect the money directly from the people. If the government has the right to levy taxes upon the people for the purpose of inducing them to establish unprofitable industries or industries which can only be made profitable by the high tariff, it is equally within its power to distribute the money to the protected industries and to pay to the producers of their products, then the bounty system is a more direct and less complex way of attaining that end, and at least has the advantage of directness and simplicity."

BUNKER HILL.

"The majority of the committee seem to think that taxation can be made a blessing and that the support of the government, instead of being a burden upon taxpayers, can be made to enrich them. If this opinion is well founded, then all the struggles for freedom which have revolved around the question of taxation have proceeded upon a false theory; and the American colonists, when they determined that they would not submit to taxation without representation, indulged in a mistaken zeal for liberty. The patriots of our forefathers did not use goods upon which Great Britain had laid an import duty as wrong if the argument for protection is right, because, according to the argument, the British importers were really paying the tax over which the American colonists went to war. There cannot be found in the wide range of economic literature an authority, with the few and rare exceptions which only serve to emphasize the general conclusion, who does not treat taxation, direct or indirect, as a burden; and when we remember that a protective tariff not only collects more for the government than is needed for its economical administration, but that it also enables favored classes to collect more than the government itself, the injustice becomes so clear and so enormous that it would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the American people to suppose that it can escape their swift and decisive condemnation."

THAT AWFUL SURPLUS.

"President Jackson hardly over-stated the danger of a surplus when he declared that it was more dangerous than a standing army; and yet, dangerous as a surplus is, it is not so dangerous as the extravagance which is always resorted to in order to prevent its accumulation. It cannot be forgotten that many of those who now advocate a high tariff and defend the extravagance which it engenders did not hesitate to denounce the administration of President Buchanan because, in its last year, the appropriations exceeded the sum of \$60,000,000. Our population at that time was nearly half what it is today, and the government was now properly and frugally administered our expenditures, including liberal pensions for the soldiers of the late war, ought not to be and would not exceed the sum of \$300,000,000."

"The friends of the protective system know that to keep the taxes high they must find some way of spending the money which has been collected. It is, therefore, the inevitable consequence of collecting more than that is proper that improper ways should be devised for spending it. The extravagance which necessitates the billion dollar appropriations which have become such a scandal upon congress had its origin in the unjust system of levying taxes for the purpose of enabling private interests to prey upon the public through favoritism of the law."

POSTERS TRUSTS.

"The bill fosters trusts," is another headline which is explained as follows: "If the system of unnecessary taxation is indefensible because of the extravagance which it encourages, it is still more so on account of the trusts which it fosters and promotes. It is not more certain that protection encourages extravagance than it is that it breeds trusts."

(Continued on Second Page.)

LITTLE ONES SLAIN

SCHOOL CHILDREN ARE THE VICTIMS OF A TORNADO.

Storm Rashes In From the Gulf and Spreads Out Over the Appalachicola system, Leaving Destruction in Its Wake—At Arlington, Ga., at 5 O'clock in the Morning, a School House Is Wrecked and a Score of Children, With Their Teacher, Killed or Injured—Reports of Fatalities From Other Points.

Louisville, Ky., March 22.—A special to the Evening Post from Atlanta, Ga., says: News of an awful disaster reached here this afternoon from Arlington, Calhoun county, this state.

A terrific cyclone struck the village at an early hour this morning and the public school building, a frame structure about 20 by 60 feet, was blown to atoms by the death-dealing cloud, which is reported to have been but little larger than a bed blanket. In the building about thirty pupils and two teachers had assembled and eight of the children were instantly killed. Their bodies were fearfully mangled and part of the timbers were mixed up with their own remains.

Ten children, some of them older than those killed, were badly injured and are dying.

Among the dead are: OLLIE PARRAMORE, ALICE PUTNAM, ALBERT BUTLER, WILLIE MURRAY, KENNETH ROYSTON, MAUDE JOHNSON, MARY WELLS.

The wounded are: Ernest Wellons; leg broken. Dudley Killbreck; both legs broken. Professor W. A. Covington; internally injured; will die. Alton Carter; leg broken. Esther Carter; internal injuries; will die. Ron McMurray; head crushed; will die. Bettie Parramore; arm broken; hurt internally. Robert Childers; shoulder dislocated. Susan Sanders; hurt internally; will die. George Riley; arm broken; hurt internally. Clara Thighen; arms broken; hurt internally; will die.

FRATERNAL STRIFE IN GUTHRIE

Some Take Their Free Silver Straight and Some Don't.

Guthrie, March 22.—War, bloody war, has been declared between Dick Reeves, the praying saloon man, and the godless Daily Leader. Reeves is at the head of a crowd which wants to make free silver the predominant idea even at church socials.

On the other hand, the Daily Leader seems to champion the cause of the silk stockings among the local Democrats. Hence these tears. Friday a convention was held here. It was called under the auspices of Dick Reeves, who wanted the free silver idea to prevail. The Leader crowd, however, concluded to part company with past associations, and, with the aid of a friendly chairman, completely ignored the champions of the free silver cause. A ticket was nominated, but free silver was nowhere mentioned in the platform.

But Mr. Reeves, the praying saloon man, was not yet defeated. He rallied the bimetallic forces Friday night at the court room for the ostensible purpose of putting an independent ticket in the field. The other fellows were onto the game and were represented in large numbers, so much so that President Reeves blandly informed them that unless they subscribed to the resolutions just presented, they would not be allowed to vote. Exactly eight persons remained in the court room, and of course the resolutions carried unanimously. They are as follows:

"Whereas, A call was made for the election of delegates in each ward of the city of Guthrie to represent such ward in a citizens' free silver convention, to nominate a citizens' free silver ticket, and such delegates were so selected for said purpose; and,

"Whereas, After said citizens' free silver convention had assembled under said call a majority of said delegates voted against retaining the words 'free silver' in the designation of the ticket, and refused to permit the use of the words 'free silver' in the resolutions adopted; and,

"Whereas, Such action was a breach of good faith, a violation of an agreement under which the call for said convention was made, and uncalled for and unnecessary repudiation of the single principle which united those who participated in the primaries, and a complete departure from the announced purpose of said convention; therefore be it resolved, That we disavow any sympathy with the action of said convention, believing that it was unwise and cowardly to abandon the principle of bimetallic reform when writing a party platform, and that it was base and unmanly to violate the express agreement as to what should be the character of said ticket."

"Resolved, That we cannot conscientiously support a ticket that represents no principle and is based on no other foundation than a desire to combine for party sakes. We believe it our duty as free silver voters to maintain an organization that will strengthen our cause, and that will unite the true friends of bimetallicism so firmly that they cannot be scattered by the combinations of men who sacrifice principle for expediency. We believe that the best way to advance the interests of bimetallicism in the city of Guthrie is to form a free silver party; that will work independently for the welfare of the cause, and no longer affiliate with men who, while professing friendship for and sympathy with bimetallicism, forsake and betray it whenever opportunity is offered at the polls."

"Resolved, That we regret that it is too late to put a free silver ticket in the field for the spring election because of the expiration of time allowed by law in which to hold a properly called convention, but that we evidence our fidelity to our principles by organizing a free silver party to be composed of men alone who hold the views herein expressed and who will subscribe their names to a declaration of these principles."

"Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to prepare a declaration of principles and to secure signatures to the same; that such committee be empowered

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS WILL NEVER, NEVER LEARN.

Grover's World-Famed Object Lesson Counts no More as Showing What a Single Dose of Tariff Reform Will Do to American Industries and Labor.

Then the Many Object Lessons of Republican Protection in Showing What That Policy Will Do for Them—Bailey and His Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—Mr. Bailey of Texas presented to the house tonight the minority report on the tariff bill.

The report was signed by all the Democratic members of the ways and means committee and gives the grounds for the opposition to the bill. It says: "This bill was framed with the avowed purpose of protecting the manufacturers of the United States against foreign competition, and it is perfectly obvious that if it accomplishes that purpose it must result in compelling the consumers of this country to pay more for their manufactured goods, and for this reason we think it should not pass. We rest our opposition upon the broad principle that congress was invested with the power of taxation as a means of collecting from each citizen his fair proportion toward the support of the government, and that it is a gross perversion of that power to employ it as a means of enabling favored classes to levy unjust charges upon the great body of the people. We believe that after contributing his proper share toward the maintenance of the government, every citizen of this republic is entitled to the full possession and enjoyment of all he can honestly earn; and we deny the right of congress to make or enforce any regulation which deprives any man of any part of his honest earnings towards encouraging the enterprise or increasing the fortune of another."

PATERNALISM.

"No man, however blind he may be, would defend a system of taxation under which the government first collected the money and afterwards distributed it among its favorites. It is true that the tariff act of 1890 ventured to this extent in dealing with the sugar growers, but the disapproval of that policy was so overwhelming and so bitter that the advocates of protection have been forced to abandon it, and they have not dared to incorporate any provision for a direct bounty in the present bill. We are unable, however, to perceive any difference in principle between a law which requires the government to collect the money and distribute it among the protected industries and a law which enables these industries to collect the money directly from the people. If the government has the right to levy taxes upon the people for the purpose of inducing them to establish unprofitable industries or industries which can only be made profitable by the high tariff, it is equally within its power to distribute the money to the protected industries and to pay to the producers of their products, then the bounty system is a more direct and less complex way of attaining that end, and at least has the advantage of directness and simplicity."

BUNKER HILL.

"The majority of the committee seem to think that taxation can be made a blessing and that the support of the government, instead of being a burden upon taxpayers, can be made to enrich them. If this opinion is well founded, then all the struggles for freedom which have revolved around the question of taxation have proceeded upon a false theory; and the American colonists, when they determined that they would not submit to taxation without representation, indulged in a mistaken zeal for liberty. The patriots of our forefathers did not use goods upon which Great Britain had laid an import duty as wrong if the argument for protection is right, because, according to the argument, the British importers were really paying the tax over which the American colonists went to war. There cannot be found in the wide range of economic literature an authority, with the few and rare exceptions which only serve to emphasize the general conclusion, who does not treat taxation, direct or indirect, as a burden; and when we remember that a protective tariff not only collects more for the government than is needed for its economical administration, but that it also enables favored classes to collect more than the government itself, the injustice becomes so clear and so enormous that it would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the American people to suppose that it can escape their swift and decisive condemnation."

THAT AWFUL SURPLUS.

"President Jackson hardly over-stated the danger of a surplus when he declared that it was more dangerous than a standing army; and yet, dangerous as a surplus is, it is not so dangerous as the extravagance which is always resorted to in order to prevent its accumulation. It cannot be forgotten that many of those who now advocate a high tariff and defend the extravagance which it engenders did not hesitate to denounce the administration of President Buchanan because, in its last year, the appropriations exceeded the sum of \$60,000,000. Our population at that time was nearly half what it is today, and the government was now properly and frugally administered our expenditures, including liberal pensions for the soldiers of the late war, ought not to be and would not exceed the sum of \$300,000,000."

"The friends of the protective system know that to keep the taxes high they must find some way of spending the money which has been collected. It is, therefore, the inevitable consequence of collecting more than that is proper that improper ways should be devised for spending it. The extravagance which necessitates the billion dollar appropriations which have become such a scandal upon congress had its origin in the unjust system of levying taxes for the purpose of enabling private interests to prey upon the public through favoritism of the law."

POSTERS TRUSTS.

"The bill fosters trusts," is another headline which is explained as follows: "If the system of unnecessary taxation is indefensible because of the extravagance which it encourages, it is still more so on account of the trusts which it fosters and promotes. It is not more certain that protection encourages extravagance than it is that it breeds trusts."

(Continued on Second Page.)

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS WILL NEVER, NEVER LEARN.

Grover's World-Famed Object Lesson Counts no More as Showing What a Single Dose of Tariff Reform Will Do to American Industries and Labor.

Then the Many Object Lessons of Republican Protection in Showing What That Policy Will Do for Them—Bailey and His Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—Mr. Bailey of Texas presented to the house tonight the minority report on the tariff bill.

The report was signed by all the Democratic members of the ways and means committee and gives the grounds for the opposition to the bill. It says: "This bill was framed with the avowed purpose of protecting the manufacturers of the United States against foreign competition, and it is perfectly obvious that if it accomplishes that purpose it must result in compelling the consumers of this country to pay more for their manufactured goods, and for this reason we think it should not pass. We rest our opposition upon the broad principle that congress was invested with the power of taxation as a means of collecting from each citizen his fair proportion toward the support of the government, and that it is a gross perversion of that power to employ it as a means of enabling favored classes to levy unjust charges upon the great body of the people. We believe that after contributing his proper share toward the maintenance of the government, every citizen of this republic is entitled to the full possession and enjoyment of all he can honestly earn; and we deny the right of congress to make or enforce any regulation which deprives any man of any part of his honest earnings towards encouraging the enterprise or increasing the fortune of another."

PATERNALISM.

"No man, however blind he may be, would defend a system of taxation under which the government first collected the money and afterwards distributed it among its favorites. It is true that the tariff act of 1890 ventured to this extent in dealing with the sugar growers, but the disapproval of that policy was so overwhelming and so bitter that the advocates of protection have been forced to abandon it, and they have not dared to incorporate any provision for a direct bounty in the present bill. We are unable, however, to perceive any difference in principle between a law which requires the government to collect the money and distribute it among the protected industries and a law which enables these industries to collect the money directly from the people. If the government has the right to levy taxes upon the people for the purpose of inducing them to establish unprofitable industries or industries which can only be made profitable by the high tariff, it is equally within its power to distribute the money to the protected industries and to pay to the producers of their products, then the bounty system is a more direct and less complex way of attaining that end, and at least has the advantage of directness and simplicity."

BUNKER HILL.

"The majority of the committee seem to think that taxation can be made a blessing and that the support of the government, instead of being a burden upon taxpayers, can be made to enrich them. If this opinion is well founded, then all the struggles for freedom which have revolved around the question of taxation have proceeded upon a false theory; and the American colonists, when they determined that they would not submit to taxation without representation, indulged in a mistaken zeal for liberty. The patriots of our forefathers did not use goods upon which Great Britain had laid an import duty as wrong if the argument for protection is right, because, according to the argument, the British importers were really paying the tax over which the American colonists went to war. There cannot be found in the wide range of economic literature an authority, with the few and rare exceptions which only serve to emphasize the general conclusion, who does not treat taxation, direct or indirect, as a burden; and when we remember that a protective tariff not only collects more for the government than is needed for its economical administration, but that it also enables favored classes to collect more than the government itself, the injustice becomes so clear and so enormous that it would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the American people to suppose that it can escape their swift and decisive condemnation."

THAT AWFUL SURPLUS.

"President Jackson hardly over-stated the danger of a surplus when he declared that it was more dangerous than a standing army; and yet, dangerous as a surplus is, it is not so dangerous as the extravagance which is always resorted to in order to prevent its accumulation. It cannot be forgotten that many of those who now advocate a high tariff and defend the extravagance which it engenders did not hesitate to denounce the administration of President Buchanan because, in its last year, the appropriations exceeded the sum of \$60,000,000. Our population at that time was nearly half what it is today, and the government was now properly and frugally administered our expenditures, including liberal pensions for the soldiers of the late war, ought not to be and would not exceed the sum of \$300,000,000."

"The friends of the protective system know that to keep the taxes high they must find some way of spending the money which has been collected. It is, therefore, the inevitable consequence of collecting more than that is proper that improper ways should be devised for spending it. The extravagance which necessitates the billion dollar appropriations which have become such a scandal upon congress had its origin in the unjust system of levying taxes for the purpose of enabling private interests to prey upon the public through favoritism of the law."

POSTERS TRUSTS.

"The bill fosters trusts," is another headline which is explained as follows: "If the system of unnecessary taxation is indefensible because of the extravagance which it encourages, it is still more so on account of the trusts which it fosters and promotes. It is not more certain that protection encourages extravagance than it is that it breeds trusts."

(Continued on Second Page.)

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS WILL NEVER, NEVER LEARN.

Grover's World-Famed Object Lesson Counts no More as Showing What a Single Dose of Tariff Reform Will Do to American Industries and Labor.

Then the Many Object Lessons of Republican Protection in Showing What That Policy Will Do for Them—Bailey and His Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—Mr. Bailey of Texas presented to the house tonight the minority report on the tariff bill.

The report was signed by all the Democratic members of the ways and means committee and gives the grounds for the opposition to the bill. It says: "This bill was framed with the avowed purpose of protecting the manufacturers of the United States against foreign competition, and it is perfectly obvious that if it accomplishes that purpose it must result in compelling the consumers of this country to pay more for their manufactured goods, and for this reason we think it should not pass. We rest our opposition upon the broad principle that congress was invested with the power of taxation as a means of collecting from each citizen his fair proportion toward the support of the government, and that it is a gross perversion of that power to employ it as a means of enabling favored classes to levy unjust charges upon the great body of the people. We believe that after contributing his proper share toward the maintenance of the government, every citizen of this republic is entitled to the full possession and enjoyment of all he can honestly earn; and we deny the right of congress to make or enforce any regulation which deprives any man of any part of his honest earnings towards encouraging the enterprise or increasing the fortune of another."

PATERNALISM.

"No man, however blind he may be, would defend a system of taxation under which the government first collected the money and afterwards distributed it among its favorites. It is true that the tariff act of 1890 ventured to this extent in dealing with the sugar growers, but the disapproval of that policy was so overwhelming and so bitter that the advocates of protection have been forced to abandon it, and they have not dared to incorporate any provision for a direct bounty in the present bill. We are unable, however, to perceive any difference in principle between a law which requires the government to collect the money and distribute it among the protected industries and a law which enables these industries to collect the money directly from the people. If the government has the right to levy taxes upon the people for the purpose of inducing them to establish unprofitable industries or industries which can only be made profitable by the high tariff, it is equally within its power to distribute the money to the protected industries and to pay to the producers of their products, then the bounty system is a more direct and less complex way of attaining that end, and at least has the advantage of directness and simplicity."

BUNKER HILL.

"The majority of the committee seem to think that taxation can be made a blessing and that the support of the government, instead of being a burden upon taxpayers, can be made to enrich them. If this opinion is well founded, then all the struggles for freedom which have revolved around the question of taxation have proceeded upon a false theory; and the American colonists, when they determined that they would not submit to taxation without representation, indulged in a mistaken zeal for liberty. The patriots of our forefathers did not use goods upon which Great Britain had laid an import duty as wrong if the argument for protection is right, because, according to the argument, the British importers were really paying the tax over which the American colonists went to war. There cannot be found in the wide range of economic literature an authority, with the few and rare exceptions which only serve to emphasize the general conclusion, who does not treat taxation, direct or indirect, as a burden; and when we remember that a protective tariff not only collects more for the government than is needed for its economical administration, but that it also enables favored classes to collect more than the government itself, the injustice becomes so clear and so enormous that it would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the American people to suppose that it can escape their swift and decisive condemnation."

THAT AWFUL SURPLUS.

"President Jackson hardly over-stated the danger of a surplus when he declared that it was more dangerous than a standing army; and yet, dangerous as a surplus is, it is not so dangerous as the extravagance which is always resorted to in order to prevent its accumulation. It cannot be forgotten that many of those who now advocate a high tariff and defend the extravagance which it engenders did not hesitate to denounce the administration of President Buchanan because, in its last year, the appropriations exceeded the sum of \$60,000,000. Our population at that time was nearly half what it is today, and the government was now properly and frugally administered our expenditures, including liberal pensions for the soldiers of the late war, ought not to be and would not exceed the sum of \$300,000,000."

"The friends of the protective system know that to keep the taxes high they must find some way of spending the money which has been collected. It is, therefore, the inevitable consequence of collecting more than that is proper that improper ways should be devised for spending it. The extravagance which necessitates the billion dollar appropriations which have become such a scandal upon congress had its origin in the unjust system of levying taxes for the purpose of enabling private interests to prey upon the public through favoritism of the law."

POSTERS TRUSTS.

"The bill fosters trusts," is another headline which is explained as follows: "If the system of unnecessary taxation is indefensible because of the extravagance which it encourages, it is still more so on account of the trusts which it fosters and promotes. It is not more certain that protection encourages extravagance than it is that it breeds trusts."

(Continued on Second Page.)

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS WILL NEVER, NEVER LEARN.

Grover's World-Famed Object Lesson Counts no More as Showing What a Single Dose of Tariff Reform Will Do to American Industries and Labor.

Then the Many Object Lessons of Republican Protection in Showing What That Policy Will Do for Them—Bailey and His Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—Mr. Bailey of Texas presented to the house tonight the minority report on the tariff bill.

The report was signed by all the Democratic members of the ways and means committee and gives the grounds for the opposition to the bill. It says: "This bill was framed with the avowed purpose of protecting the manufacturers of the United States against foreign competition, and it is perfectly obvious that if it accomplishes that purpose it must result in compelling the consumers of this country to pay more for their manufactured goods, and for this reason we think it should not pass. We rest our opposition upon the broad principle that congress was invested with the power of taxation as a means of collecting from each citizen his fair proportion toward the support of the government, and that it is a gross perversion of that power to employ it as a means of enabling favored classes to levy unjust charges upon the great body of the people. We believe that after contributing his proper share toward the maintenance of the government, every citizen of this republic is entitled to the full possession and enjoyment of all he can honestly earn; and we deny the right of congress to make or enforce any regulation which deprives any man of any part of his honest earnings towards encouraging the enterprise or increasing the fortune of another."

PATERNALISM.

"No man, however blind he may be, would defend a system of taxation under which the government first collected the money and afterwards distributed it among its favorites. It is true that the tariff act of 1890 ventured to this extent in dealing with the sugar growers, but the disapproval of that policy was so overwhelming and so bitter that the advocates of protection have been forced to abandon it, and they have not dared to incorporate any provision for a direct bounty in the present bill. We are unable, however, to perceive any difference in principle between a law which requires the government to collect the money and distribute it among the protected industries and a law which enables these industries to collect the money directly from the people. If the government has the right to levy taxes upon the people for the purpose of inducing them to establish unprofitable industries or industries which can only be made profitable by the high tariff, it is equally within its power to distribute the money to the protected industries and to pay to the producers of their products, then the bounty system is a more direct and less complex way of attaining that end, and at least has the advantage of directness and simplicity."

BUNKER HILL.

"The majority of the committee seem to think that taxation can be made a blessing and that the support of the government, instead of being a burden upon taxpayers, can be made to enrich them. If this opinion is well founded, then all the struggles for freedom which have revolved around the question of taxation have proceeded upon a false theory; and the American colonists, when they determined that they would not submit to taxation without representation, indulged in a mistaken zeal for liberty. The patriots of our forefathers did not use goods upon which Great Britain had laid an import duty as wrong if the argument for protection is right, because, according to the argument, the British importers were really paying the tax over which the American colonists went to war. There cannot be found in the wide range of economic literature an authority, with the few and rare exceptions which only serve to emphasize the general conclusion, who does not treat taxation, direct or indirect, as a burden; and when we remember that a protective tariff not only collects more for the government than is needed for its economical administration, but that it also enables favored classes to collect more than the government itself, the injustice becomes so clear and so enormous that it would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the American people to suppose that it can escape their swift and decisive condemnation."

THAT AWFUL SURPLUS.

"President Jackson hardly over-stated the danger of a surplus when he declared that it was more dangerous than a standing army; and yet, dangerous as a surplus is, it is not so dangerous as the extravagance which is always resorted to in order to prevent its accumulation. It cannot be forgotten that many of those who now advocate a high tariff and defend the extravagance which it engenders did not hesitate to denounce the administration of President Buchanan because, in its last year, the appropriations exceeded the sum of \$60,000,000. Our population at that time was nearly half what it is today, and the government was now properly and frugally administered our expenditures, including liberal pensions for the soldiers of the late war, ought not to be and would not exceed the sum of \$300,000,000."

"The friends of the protective system know that to keep the taxes high they must find some way of spending the money which has been collected. It is, therefore, the inevitable consequence of collecting more than that is proper that improper ways should be devised for spending it. The extravagance which necessitates the billion dollar appropriations which have become such a scandal upon congress had its origin in the unjust system of levying taxes for the purpose of enabling private interests to prey upon the public through favoritism of the law."

POSTERS TRUSTS.

"The bill fosters trusts," is another headline which is explained as follows: "If the system of unnecessary taxation is indefensible because of the extravagance which it encourages, it is still more so on account of the trusts which it fosters and promotes. It is not more certain that protection encourages extravagance than it is that it breeds trusts."

(Continued on Second Page.)

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS WILL NEVER, NEVER LEARN.

Grover's World-Famed Object Lesson Counts no More as Showing What a Single Dose of Tariff Reform Will Do to American Industries and Labor.

Then the Many Object Lessons of Republican Protection in Showing What That Policy Will Do for Them—Bailey and His Minority Report.

Washington, March 22.—Mr. Bailey of Texas presented to the house tonight the minority report on the tariff bill.

The report was signed by all the Democratic members of the ways and means committee and gives the grounds for the opposition to the bill. It says: "This bill was framed with the avowed purpose